DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 105 760 FL 006 849

TITLE	Perspectives on International Scholarly Exchange: A Report of a Conference.
INSTITUTION	Council for International Exchange of Scholars, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[72]
NOTE	34p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Conference Reports; Educational Finance; *Exchange Programs; Fellowships; Foreign Relations; Grants; Interinstitutional Cooperation; *International Education; International Organizations; *International Programs; Scholarships; *Study Abroad
IDENTIFIERS	*Fulbright Hays Act

ABSTRACT

This is a report on a conference held in August of 1972 at the National Academy of Sciences Summer Studies Center in Woods Hole, Massachusetts, by the CIES (Council for International Exchange of Scholars). The main purpose of the conference was to: review the various philosophies and interests that have influenced the conduct of the Fulbright program over the 25 years of its existence; consider the possible new dimensions for the committee's activities; renew its ties with the sponsoring councils; orient new members to the committee's functions and responsibilities; review the committee's relationship to other international exchange programs; and consider its future role. A summary contains the principal conclusions and recommendations of the conference. Appendices contain information on the Fulbright-Hays Program for Senior Scholars and on the potential of the Fulbright-Hays Act. (Author/AM)

ED105760

A Report of a Conference

Perspectives on International Scholarly Exchange

held at
The National Academy of Sciences Summer Studies Center
Houston House
WOODS HOLE, MASSACHUSETTS

August 24–25, 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FL 006 849

COUNCIL FOR INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OF SCHOLARS
Formerly Committee for International Exchange of Persons
2101 Constitution Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20418

2/3

Foreword

The Conference described in the following pages took place two years ago, but many of the issues discussed are as relevant to the international exchange of scholars today as they were in 1972. Accordingly the Council has decided to make the report available to a larger number of those who are interested in the history and the future of the senior Fulbright-Hays Program.

The report should be viewed as an account of a rather loosely structured discussion of international scholarly exchange. It is not a description of all of the activities or interests of the Council for International Exchange of Scholars or of the other agencies whose relationships to the senior Fulbright-Hays program are examined. Nor is it a definitive statement of the philosophic principles and objectives of the CIES and its sponsoring Councils.

Woods Hole provided the CIES with a much needed opportunity for taking stock, and we are grateful to the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Academy of Sciences, and the Social Science Research Council for grants to support the Conference and permit some subsequent planning activities.

CHARLES BLITZER

Contents

BACKGROUND 1

OPERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS 2

The Conference Board of Associated Research Councils 2
The SSRC and the ACLS 3
American Council on Education 4
National Academy of Sciences 5
The Board of Foreign Scholarships 5
The Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs 6
The Overseas Foundations and Commissions 7
Educational Exchange under AID--a Related Program 7

PLANS AND PERSPECTIVES 9

The Changed Environment of International Educational Exchange 9
Exchange with Developing Countries 9
Exchange with More Developed Countries 10
Proposal for Joint Planning Conferences 10
Long-range Planning Teams 10
Collaborative Projects 11
Teaching Teams and Cluster Appointments 11

SUMMARY 14

APPENDIXES

The Fulbright-Hays Program for Senior Scholars: A Brief Overview 17
The Potential of the Fulbright-Hays Act 24
Conference Participants 29

Background

The decision to hold a special meeting to discuss ways to implement the Board of Foreign Scholarships' statement on *Educational Exchange in the Seventies* was made at the April 1972 meeting in Washington, D.C. of the Committee on International Exchange of Persons (CIEP). The scope of the meeting was later broadened to include a review of the Committee's relationship to other international exchange programs and consideration of its future role. A two-day conference was scheduled for August 24 and 25 and the presidents of the four sponsoring Councils, the chairman of the Board of Foreign Scholarships, and representatives of government agencies, foundations, and the academic community were invited. The Council presidents were asked to participate for both days; the others to join the group on the second day. The Summer Studies Center of the National Academy of Sciences at Woods Hole, Massachusetts was selected as the Conference site, and financial support for the Conference and subsequent planning and development activities was obtained from the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Academy of Sciences, and the Social Science Research Council.

The immediate usefulness of the Conference lay in the opportunity it provided for a review of the various philosophies and interests that have influenced the conduct of the Fulbright Program over the 25 years of its existence; in the consideration of possible new dimensions for the Committee's activities; in renewing and strengthening ties with the sponsoring Councils; and in the orientation of new members (six of thirteen were appointed in 1972) to the Committee's functions and responsibilities. While no blueprint for change emerged, either in the Program or in the Committee's role, some of the requisite conditions for thinking constructively about these matters were achieved. It is not an exaggeration to say that the CIEP has not engaged in such a major examination of policy issues in nearly twenty years.

Operational Relationships

A substantial part of the Conference was devoted to the elucidation of the operational relationships affecting the Committee's work and a discussion of how these relationships could be made more effective. The roles and activities of the four Councils that comprise the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, the Board of Foreign Scholarships, the Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, and the overseas binational Foundations and Commissions were all discussed.

The Conference Board of Associated Research Councils

In 1947 the Department of State, which had been designated to administer the newly authorized Fulbright Program, turned to three outside agencies for assistance. The Institute of International Education was asked to administer competitions for graduate study awards; the United States Office of Education, for primary and secondary school teacher exchanges; the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, for university lecturing and postdoctoral research grants. The Conference Board had been organized in 1944 by the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Research Council, and the Social Science Research Council "to consider matters of concern to more than one Council . . . and to provide a channel of communication between Government agencies and the Councils." In 1946 the American Council on Education joined the Board, thus bringing virtually all universities and colleges in the United States, as well as all major scholarly and research organizations under its organizational umbrella. The Board established the Committee on International Exchange of Persons to carry out its responsibilities with respect to the Fulbright Program, and continues to maintain cognizance of the Committee.

During the first years of the Program's operation, all four Councils had offices in Washington, D.C., and members of their staffs were closely involved in the development of CIEP administrative procedures and operating policies. In the early 1950's, however, the main office of the American Council of Learned Societies was moved to New York City; in the summer of 1951, the Washington office of the Social Science Research Council was discontinued. Gradually ACLS and SSRC staff members, who had served on the CIEP executive committee, were replaced by scholars residing in Washington. While the ACLS and the SSRC, along with the other Councils, have continued to make nominations for CIEP and advisory committee service, and while in several instances they have provided both counsel and support either when serious problems have developed in relations with the Department of State or the Board of Foreign Scholarships or when major policy issues have arisen, they have generally been content in recent years to follow program activities from a distance.

The American Council on Education and the National Academy of Sciences have maintained closer touch. From the beginning, the Academy has held the contract with the State Department for administration of the Program, and for many years the Committee chairman was a staff officer of the Academy. Between 1950 and 1965, the offices of the Committee were located in the American Council on Education building and ACE staff members have served on the Committee throughout its history.

Since 1950 all four Councils have in varying degrees become involved in other international activities more specific to their central concerns. While individual programs, particularly some of those administered by the ACLS and SSRC, are similar or complementary to Fulbright activities, they have moved on separate tracks. This has occurred in part because some funding agencies, usually private foundations, as well as recipients, have feared that amalgamation with a government program might handicap the private endeavor. Nevertheless, the Councils feel that the senior Fulbright Program has been successful in maintaining its academic integrity and the credibility of its claim to represent the scholarly community in these exchanges.

The Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies

In 1960 the American Council of Learned Societies embarked upon a major effort in American studies, which has supported many of the scholars who now hold chairs of American studies in their own countries.

Initially the program was confined to Western Europe, then expanded to include Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and Taiwan, and recently Eastern Europe. Except for a three-year period when some support was received from the Carnegie Corporation, the program has been funded entirely by the Ford Foundation.

The ACLS and the SSRC jointly administered the Ford Foundation-supported Foreign Area Fellowship Program from 1962 to 1972, when this program was reorganized. From the outset, the program has provided fellowships for predoctoral research in Africa, the Middle East, Asia, Western Europe and Latin America and the Caribbean. These activities have now been integrated with those of the appropriate ACLS-SSRC Joint Committees concerned with research planning and training in the several area studies fields. Also jointly sponsored by the ACLS and SSRC is the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), which arranges academic exchanges with countries in East-Central and Southeast Europe (Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Yugoslavia) and the Soviet Union. The IREX program has brought Eastern European scholars, mainly scientists and technologists, to the United States for study and research and has sent an equal number of Americans, usually in the humanities and social sciences, to the participating countries. Funds are provided by the Ford Foundation, the Department of State, and, in the last two years, the National Endowment for the Humanities.

The SSRC's purpose is to advance research in the social sciences. In addition to the aforementioned joint projects, the SSRC has sponsored various cross-national studies. Increasingly, as funds have been obtained to pay travel costs, foreign scholars are serving as members of SSRC Committees.

American Council on Education

The ACE's principal international program at this writing is the Overseas Liaison Committee, which serves as a link between higher education in the United States and "individual scholars, universities, and associations in developing nations." The Committee was established in 1959 to assist with university staffing problems in Africa; in 1971 it extended its concerns to the Caribbean, Latin America, and Asia. Its activities are financed by grants from the Carnegie Corporation, the Ford Foundation, and government contracts. The ACE's Commission on International Education was dissolved two or three years ago, but a new Office of International Programs is being established to serve as a communications link between public programs and higher education's interests and resources in the international cultural and education field.

National Academy of Sciences

The National Academy of Sciences is involved in a large number of international activities. They include: exchange agreements with the Science Academies of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union and the sponsorship of joint research activities; relationships with some 23 international scientific unions and with many universities around the world; programs involving applications of science in technical aid to developing nations; international cooperative programs in the sciences (e.g., the International Geophysical Year); the Russian-United States space docking project; an entomological project in Kenya; and many others. Funding comes from both private and governmental sources.

The Board of Foreign Scholarships

The Board of Foreign Scholarships is unique among Presidentially appointed boards in that it has a program-development as well as an advisory role. From the beginning it has had responsibility for setting basic policy for the Fulbright Program. The Board decided, for example, that the program should be binationally organized and administered overseas. It determined that grants should be made to individuals, not to institutions, and it established the policy that funds should not be used to pay for buildings, laboratory equipment, microfilm and the like. Binationality has been one of the Program's main strengths and has led to the cost-sharing arrangements now in existence in twenty countries.

The Board regards itself as a link between the United States Government and the academic community. Appointed by the President of the United States and served by a secretariat lodged in the Department of State, the Board's membership has been substantially academic. Its mission, it feels, is to maintain the intellectual and scholastic integrity of the Program. It is gratified that the Program has been able to withstand any trend toward alienation between government and the intellectual community, to be accepted by both, and to have avoided becoming the target for either the isolationists in this country or the nationalists abroad.

In celebrating its 25th anniversary, the BFS established a small distinguished lecturer program, titled the Lincoln Lectureships. The first four appointees—Paul Samuelson (Economics, MIT); Charles Townes (Physics, Berkeley); John Hope Franklin (American History, Chicago); and John Updike, the novelist—were appointed in 1972 to lecture in countries of their choice for periods of two weeks to two months. Four foreign scholars are to be nominated in 1973 to lecture in the United States.

While wishing to retain the Program's essentially academic character, the Board now seeks to increase participation of persons in such professional fields as law, journalism, management and public administration who do not have academic affiliations. It is also concerned that institutions that in the past have been insufficiently represented—small and traditionally black colleges, for example—be encouraged to participate. It hopes to enlist the continuing support of alumni in screening, orientation, planning and other ways, and to this end has begun to develop a directory of former grantees. The Committee's cooperation has been enlisted.

Though the Board would like to promote multinational projects, the fact that Fulbright funding is strictly binational and dependent upon annual legislative action is an impediment; some outside financial support would probably be essential.

The Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs

The Department of State, through the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (CU), is responsible for the overall administration of the Fulbright-Hays Program.

In the past two years CU has undertaken a thorough review of the Program with a view to increasing its effectiveness. It has established the Office of Policy and Plans to chart new directions and to relate CU activities, when feasible, to exchange efforts of other agencies. It has established a budget for research and evaluation, generally to be undertaken by private citizens and organizations. It has also made some internal studies, one of which is a detailed report on relations with principal contract agencies, including NAS. A serious effort is being made to implement many of the report's recommendations.

CU would welcome CIEP collaboration in planning as well as in carrying out the customary operational functions. Typical of questions on which the Committee's recommendations are desired are: Within the budgetary limitations of a given program, which scholars, disciplines, professions, and institutions would contribute most effectively to increased mutual understanding? Should the program be directed to the strongest institutions, or should it sometimes gamble on the weak? Is the Program likely to have greater impact if several U. S. professors participate in short, intensive programs than if a single professor is made available for a full academic year? Would it be more productive to orient the program of a senior scholar toward interaction with faculty rather than with students? How can more effective institution-to-institution relationships be developed, and to what degree can these be facilitated with the available resources? How can the overall quality

of participants in the Program be improved, not only in terms of scholarship, but also in terms of ability to communicate and create lasting ties?

The Overseas Foundations and Commissions

The annual program for each country participating in the exchange program is prepared by the binational foundation or commission abroad, or by the United States Embassy when there is no binational agency. While cooperating agencies in the United States are asked to comment on projects and the BFS must approve them, the problems of timing are such that the contribution from this country to the planning of a given program is usually slight. Quite often awards have been announced before the program review is complete. It is apparent, therefore, that if there is to be planning input from the United States, it must be in the development of guiding principles and long-term projections.

Educational Exchange under AID—a Related Program

A related and larger exchange program that often operates side by side in the field with the Fulbright Program is that run by the Agency for International Development. Some 160,000 students and scholars have come to the United States under the AID exchange program and have returned to work in their own countries; about 13,000 persons are here now, largely in the universities. Increasingly the program has moved toward the postgraduate level. Over the years AID has given major assistance, totaling about one-half billion dollars, to some 100 universities and higher research institutes abroad. This has been largely channeled through some 350 American universities, which have themselves been substantially benefited in the process.

It is difficult to evaluate the results overseas, though it is evident that many institutions have reached a stage of development and achieved a maturity they would not have had without it. As they move toward a new phase, the role of AID is changing and its support is being differently directed. A contract has been made with the American Council on Education's Overseas Liaison Committee, for example, to maintain a systematic dialogue with the Association of African Universities and individual universities to determine developmental needs, to explore the potential of research in defining and meeting such needs, and, to reexamine the role of the university in national development. Somewhat similar arrangements have been worked out to maintain relations between the United States and universities in Latin America and Asia.

Here in the United States there is growing recognition that technical training of foreign students, however good, is counterproductive if it is not geared to needs in their own countries.

Plans and Perspectives

The Changed Environment of International Educational Exchange

Conference participants generally agreed that a thorough examination of the senior Fulbright-Hays program was in order. The educational situation has changed, particularly in Asia and Latin America, since the first Fulbright agreements were concluded. In the fifties, American professors in a wide variety of fields went abroad to participate in educational programs usually geared to postwar development. At the same time, scholars came to the United States for training. In the ensuing twenty-year period, there has been a transformation of the educational scene in many countries. The overall level of university training has risen, and there is less need for visiting lecturers to teach undergraduate students. Rather, the need is for improvement of graduate training and expansion of research capacity. In some universities, visitors with specific expertise are sought to work with faculty and advanced students on a collaborative basis.

Exchange with Developing Countries

There is growing feeling that the responsibility for development should be in local hands; that new methods of working and training must be found; and that the approach should not be the direct transfer of Western technologies and ways of thinking, but the working out of technologies and educational systems adapted to the resources and needs of each country. There seemed to be agreement on the following principles for planning Fulbright programs in developing countries:

- Programs ought not to involve technical assistance, but an exchange of educational peers.

- Programs should be upgraded in academic terms; awards should not be permitted to fall into the pattern of responding to straight utilitarian requests or to operate on a purely *ad hoc* basis. Openings should be oriented not to undergraduate teaching, but to the training of teachers and to the development of comparative research. Both teaching and research should be on a collaborative basis.
- Programs should build on "islands of competence." In some countries teams might be effective—either junior senior combinations, or a number of outstanding short-term lecturers in a particular field. The latter might come in succession or together as a panel.
- Programs should strive for greater reciprocity; if funds are available to support American lecturers abroad, similar funding should be available to enable outstanding foreign scholars to lecture in this country.

Exchanges with More Developed Countries

The principal problem concerning programs in Western Europe, Australia, New Zealand, Israel and Japan is insufficient funding in relation to the interest of both American and national scholars. The CIEP believes that more senior grants should be in the research category, since particularly now American scholars feel a serious need for overseas research support, and since research grants as a rule attract more candidates with exceptional professional qualifications. The assertion that a lecturer reaches a wider audience may be countered with the argument that research frequently involves collaboration of a more lasting and meaningful nature. Moreover, most research scholars are quite willing to do a limited amount of lecturing.

Proposal for Joint Planning Conferences

The Conference participants felt that it would be profitable to bring together a group of binational commission officers and academics from abroad to discuss new patterns of program activity with a like number of interested Americans. A series of meetings by geographical area, which would involve planning across national boundaries, was suggested.

Long-Range Planning Teams

Another device that has been experimented with in the past and may be deserving of reconsideration now is the use of long-range planning teams. The teams would be composed of specialists in fields that have been selected for development in a given country. The team members need not travel together. Their programs would be arranged with the

assistance of the binational commission. Although it is anticipated that they would have local acquaintances, the commission could put them in touch with additional scholars in their respective fields to ascertain mutual interests and possible ways of working together. Ideally persons selected to serve on such teams would agree to accept a continuing responsibility for the project at hand. At least a two-year commitment would be desirable.

The value of the teams that were deployed to several countries in 1967 and 1968 was not demonstrated in most cases. Unfortunately, program funds were drastically reduced at the time the teams' recommendations might have been implemented. In some areas, however, most notably Latin America, their recommendations have had considerable influence on country programs and operations.

Collaborative Projects

A key need in both planning and program operations is the more active involvement of scholars, professional groups, universities and other academic organizations. While most of the conference participants believe that individual grants should continue to be available for the outstanding scholar, even when the project may be somewhat specialized, there seemed to be a feeling that an excellent scholar collaborating with colleagues in the host country on problems of mutual interest would serve the purposes of the program more effectively. Grafting the efforts of Fulbright grantees to ongoing research projects abroad as well as in the United States would seem a desirable approach.

Teaching Teams and Cluster Appointments

Several concrete suggestions for implementation of the BFS Statement of *Educational Exchange in the Seventies* came from Monroe Donsker, Vice Chairman of the CIEP. His proposals are summarized below:

a. Development of team projects to improve the status of a designated field in the host country

A team, possibly from a single institution, would be composed of a distinguished senior scholar and several recent Ph.D.'s or advanced graduate students, who would serve as junior lecturers. The senior scholar would act as coordinator, work with the faculty at the host institution, and supervise the teaching-research program of the junior lecturers. He would be expected to visit the institution two or three times a year to consult with faculty in the development of collaborative and comparative research programs and to lecture in his specialization.

b. Cluster appointments

An institution would announce that in a subsequent year it planned to develop a "special year" in a particular field. This might be a quite specific research topic or a rather broadly conceived area of activity. Participants would be selected for their specialized knowledge. The host institution would seek funds to attract several distinguished visiting scholars and a number of brilliant young postdoctoral scholars and graduate students. A project of this kind would make it possible to concentrate talent in a situation that might not otherwise be especially attractive. Cluster appointments could lead to a higher visibility for the program and might also encourage additional funding from outside the Fulbright program: the host institution, other fellowship programs, and, the home institutions of the participants. They could readily be adapted to multinational arrangements.

c. Channeling funds to American institutions for the support of foreign postdoctoral scholars

In each discipline there are a few well-recognized centers that provide the most fruitful opportunities for postdoctoral study. Formerly many of these had funds at their disposal that enabled them to include foreign scholars among fellowship recipients. In the present tight financial situation, little money is available for this obviously important purpose. If program funds were allocated, it would probably be most efficient to give the institutions direct responsibility for inviting applications and screening candidates.

d. Expanding the roster of individuals qualified for lecturing assignments in developing countries, by requesting nominations from senior faculty members known to CIEP advisory screening and other committees.

The Committee discussed these suggestions at some length, and a number of questions were raised. One was that the special-year or cluster approach appears to place undue emphasis on excellence in scholarship for its own sake, which is not the central objective of the Fulbright program. Another was that many country programs are too small for such concentration of resources. A third was that too close adherence to a plan or program could result in grants to those who fitted the pattern rather than those who had the most to contribute.

The proposal is not, however, that team or cluster grants replace the present format of the Fulbright program, with the opportunity it provides for individual exchange, but that, in cases in which multiple grants in a field would be feasible and of clear value both to the host country or institution and to foreign and American scholars, they be tried on an experimental basis. Such team or cluster grants would require con-

siderable administrative foresight and a strong commitment not only by the binational commission but also by the host institution and the professions selected for development, both abroad and in the United States. Direct communication through international travel for planners and organizers would be a necessity.

Summary

The principal conclusions of the Conference are:

- The Fulbright-Hays Program has made and is continuing to make an important contribution even though it is small and only one of many enterprises devoted to international scholarly exchange; the CIEP reaffirms its dedication to the goals of the Program.
- Because it is small, the Program cannot be all-inclusive; it should try to retain its distinctive academic character.
- Programs should be developed at the country level with due concern for local objectives. While experimenting with thematic and team approaches—and these should involve more than simply repackaging of old projects—it is important to maintain opportunities for individual scholars.
- Since many country programs are too small for "teams" to be feasible, regional projects may be useful for introducing team or thematic activities. To explore this possibility the CIEP would like to see several commission and academic representatives brought to the United States for a thorough discussion of program planning with area/screening and CIEP representatives, as well as with CU and the BFS. The decision as to which area might be involved in the initial discussions would be based on an estimate of where the prospects are most favorable for experimentation and for transnational planning.
- Teams similar to the Long-range Planning Teams of the mid-60's are among the most promising means of developing new projects since they provide for active participation by both United States and foreign scholars in the planning process. A team may consist of two or three scholars in different disciplines engaged in a broad assessment of the whole program, or of a series of American specialists in a field that one commission or more wishes to develop.

• An evaluation of the present program is needed. In this connection attention should be given to the experiences and recommendations of grantees. More travel opportunities should be available for field consultation for Committee and staff members. More research on all aspects of program administration and participation, from program planning and implementation to selection, is essential.

• A study should be made of both the amount and form of grants to determine their adequacy.

• An effort should be made to improve the funding situation for the operation of the Committee. So long as the only funds available to the Committee are those provided by annual appropriations, and the budget is often not known until well within the fiscal year for which funds are appropriated, projects often languish for lack of continuity. Resources should be available to support an ever-increasing range of useful private exchange efforts that may need only travel costs or small grants-in-aid for realization.

• In principle the CIEP would welcome the opportunity to take on related activities outside the Fulbright program if such activities brought with them the needed funding and staff. The Committee's resources—in addition to the competence and interest of its members and consultants—include the following:

a. An exceptionally stable staff with an extensive network of relationships with individual scholars, colleges, universities and educational organizations, both in the United States and abroad

b. Experience in both the operation of competitions and in the direct recruitment of university staff for assignments abroad, and in the implementation of a generally effective screening system for applications in virtually any academic area

c. A register of some 14,000 scholars interested in overseas service. The register is computerized and its listings include the name of the scholar, age, sex, number of dependents, highest academic degree, field of specialization, professional affiliation, language competency, and preferred country or area. Developed as a recruitment aid, its entries are kept current and it is constantly being expanded in relevant areas

By broadening its administrative responsibilities and its financial base, the CIEP believes that it can make a more significant contribution to international scholarly exchange while at the same time enhancing its services to the Fulbright-Hays Program.

APPENDIXES

The two papers presented here were prepared by CIEP Staff Assistant John Holzman, with the assistance of the Committee staff, as background for the Conference. They have since undergone some editorial revision. Their content is necessarily general; they were intended to provide a framework for discussion rather than a definitive and detailed analysis.

THE FULBRIGHT-HAYS PROGRAM FOR SENIOR SCHOLARS: A BRIEF OVERVIEW

Since its beginnings in the early postwar years the United States program for the exchange of students, teachers and senior scholars has become a widely accepted and important part of the academic world. The program was initially proposed and sponsored by Senator J. William Fulbright in 1946. At that time he introduced legislation authorizing an international educational exchange program to be financed by the foreign currencies obtained through the sale of United States surplus war materiel abroad. The rationale behind the program was the widespread belief—both then and now—that mutual knowledge and understanding would lead to more amicable relations among states and further the cause of peace. In addition, scholars and scientists throughout the world wished to renew communications that had been almost totally severed during the World War. Finally, the exchange program was regarded as one method by which the United States could actively reaffirm its abandonment of the policy of isolationism.

The new Act authorized a pattern of overseas scholarships significantly different from any program up to that time. These differences have continued to characterize the Fulbright program. First, by establishing a system of binational agreements between this country and others, it put the exchange of students, teachers and senior scholars for the first time on a truly world wide basis. By 1950, the new program involved 20 countries around the globe. Furthermore, larger amounts of funds were available than for any previous exchange program. The Act stipulated that awards be two-way, providing grants

for foreigners to study in the United States as well as for Americans to study abroad. The assumption was that each side could learn and profit from the other. In addition, program development would be bilateral, with both the United States and the participating country jointly involved in the planning process.

During the late forties and the fifties the original Fulbright Act was supplemented by further legislation. In 1948 the Smith-Mundt Act made possible some educational exchange with countries whose governments had not signed formal exchange agreements and enabled Fulbright lecturers going to countries outside of Europe to receive some supplementary dollar support. In 1953 and 1954 Congress, responding to the growing popularity of the program and the rapidly diminishing funds from the sale of war materiel, authorized the use of U.S.-owned foreign currencies from any source, including the sale of surplus U.S. agricultural commodities, by the exchange program. This action more than doubled the number of countries eligible to participate and greatly increased the funds available. Finally, in 1961 the many pieces of legislation affecting educational exchange were consolidated into the Fulbright-Hays Act. This Act broadened the scope of the program, gave it new flexibility and assured it of dollars as well as foreign currencies. Since 1961 the Fulbright-Hays Act has been the basis for the Department of State's entire international educational and cultural exchange program.

The successful implementation of the exchange program requires close cooperation between the participating governments and the academic community. In the United States, at least, rapport has not always been characteristic of the relations between the federal bureaucracy and academe, but they have been able to work together in the conduct of the educational exchange program. Their relations have been facilitated by several sensitive agencies that, in effect, serve as intermediaries. One of these is the Board of Foreign Scholarships. The Board is composed of twelve men and women who are appointed by the President and are drawn from both academic and public life. The Board has responsibility for determining general policy and for giving final approval to all country projects and grants. In addition, a number of relatively independent cooperating agencies, representing academic and scholarly institutions, work with the officers of the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs in administering the day-to-day operations of the educational exchange program. Overseas, in about half the participating countries there are binational commissions or foundations, responsible for the local administration of the program. The commissions are composed of both nationals of the country and Americans in residence there. In countries where there are no bina-

tional agencies, the United States Embassy performs the functions of the commission. These include consultation with appropriate local educational institutions and government officials, screening of local candidates for grants, selecting qualified educational institutions to participate in the program, planning educational exchange projects, approving and arranging for the affiliation of American scholars nominated for these projects, and providing support services for them.

The Committee on International Exchange of Persons is the principal cooperating agency concerned with the exchange of university level lecturers and scholars engaged in advanced research under the Fulbright program. The CIEP was established in 1947 by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils specifically to help implement the newly passed Fulbright Act. The parent body, the Conference Board, is a non-governmental agency which, since World War II, has served as a liaison organization for the four national academic research Councils: the American Council on Education, the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Research Council, and the Social Science Research Council. Together the four Councils embrace most of the independent scholarly and professional organizations in the country, including the institutions of higher education themselves. Contract administration for the CIEP is provided by the National Academy of Sciences.

The CIEP is composed of 13 members—a chairman and three representatives from each of the four Councils of the Conference Board appointed for overlapping three year terms. The full Committee meets twice a year and a five-member executive group meets when necessary. Members also serve on Area Advisory Committees, each corresponding to a major global region. Serving with them on the Area Committees are a number of Committee Associates with particular area or discipline competence. Finally, there are about 50 Advisory Screening Committees representing different fields of academic specialization. Nearly 200 scholars and scientists sit on the Screening Committees and assist in the selection process.

In addition to its formal relationship to the academic community, the CIEP has developed an extensive network of contacts on the individual level. There are Faculty Fulbright Advisers in approximately 1000 American universities and colleges who keep their colleagues informed of overseas opportunities under the Fulbright program. Officials at many institutions assist the Committee staff in placing foreign scholars. Perhaps most important, former American Fulbright scholars have demonstrated a continuing interest in the program. Many of them are willing to serve without compensation on Screening Committees or as consultants on specific matters. The cohesiveness of this network has

been reinforced by continued long-term interaction between the Committee staff and the academic advisors.

The CIEP staff numbers about forty. Most of the senior members have many years' experience with the Fulbright Program. Staff assignments are divided along geographic and functional lines. In general, individual program officers work with either Americans going to or foreigners coming from a specific group of countries; one or two deal with both American and foreign scholars. Each year the Committee publicizes the awards available to American scholars and screens applicants on a competitive basis, nominates candidates to the overseas commissions for consideration, and recruits university lecturers for openings not filled through the competition. Recruitment has become a growing task as the binational commissions have tended to define more precisely the nature of the openings and ask for more specialized persons. The requirement that many grantees be proficient in the local language increases the difficulty. For foreign scholars coming to the United States, the CIEP provides assistance in arranging affiliation with American institutions and in planning their scholarly program, and in a host of personal services involving such matters as visas, insurance and grant disbursement. In addition, the Committee organizes several conferences during the academic year.

Between 1949 and 1970 over 20,000 research scholars and university lecturers were exchanged under the Fulbright program, about half going each way. About one-third of the Americans and three-quarters of the foreigners have been research scholars. The grantees represent nearly every conceivable area of academic specialization. The State Department has estimated that over 250,000 Americans and about 675,000 foreigners have had classroom or seminar contact with the university lecturers alone.

Over the years there have been several notable changes in the direction and character of the senior program. Among them have been a continuing shift from research grants for Americans towards lectureships, accompanied by an emphasis on projects rather than individual academic activity; certain retrenchments precipitated by the budget cut in 1969; and the emergence of cost-sharing agreements with other governments.

In the early years of the program research grants accounted for a substantial proportion of total awards to Americans. The high point for research grants was 1949-50, when they amounted to 65% of the total. Since then there has been a steady decrease in the percentage of research grants. In 1970 they accounted for less than 25% of total grants. Moreover, about half the recent research awards have been for

travel only. To a large extent, this trend has resulted from the changing type of countries participating in the program. During the early years, although Burma and the Republic of China were the first to sign exchange agreements, most of the countries were relatively advanced technologically. Furthermore, many of them shared with the United States the heritage of Western culture. Under these circumstances, it is hardly surprising that research grants predominated. In the biological and physical sciences, both sides were more or less equal, and each could benefit through exchange research grants. In the social sciences and humanities, scholars naturally wished to engage in research within a milieu more or less similar to their own or to conduct field studies in countries that had not been available to them during the war years. Finally, country programs were relatively unstructured and allowed for independent investigation in many different fields. In general, the early participating countries felt no need to catch up with the United States in knowledge; rather, there was a strong desire to collaborate in the pursuit of knowledge. This feeling was generally reciprocated by American scholars.

During the fifties and sixties many new exchange agreements were signed, greatly expanding the number of participating countries. By and large, the new participants tended to be less developed countries. The governments of these countries felt the need to acquire the knowledge and tools that the Western world already possessed and utilize them for their own developmental goals. As a result, the commissions planned their exchange programs with an emphasis upon lectureships in the applied sciences and education rather than research grants. At the same time, relatively few American scholars in fields other than the social sciences expressed a desire to engage in research in these countries. It may be assumed that the absence of interest on the part of Americans was due in part to a general unfamiliarity with the countries and, particularly in the sciences, to a lack of adequate research facilities. As the number of participating less-developed countries grew, research grants played a less important role.

This trend has been reinforced by the policies of the Board of Foreign Scholarships, the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, and perhaps most directly, by the United States Information Service, which is invariably represented on the Boards of the overseas foundations and commissions. These organizations have as a rule considered the goals of mutual understanding and establishing contacts with potential leaders to be as important, if not more important, than the goals of research and scholarship. A common view has been that university lecturers meet and address more persons, and thus have more opportunity to

influence them favorably toward the United States. Lectureships in American Studies have been well represented in most country programs.

At least one study, however, has challenged the opinion that lectureships yield the greater return. Gordon Macgregor, in a report entitled, *The Experiences of American Scholars in Countries of the Near East and South Asia* (Monograph Number 5, 1962, Society for Applied Anthropology), held that research grants are more productive in terms of both mutual understanding and scholarship. He wrote:

"Significant among the advantages of these research awards are the opportunities for independence of action and for acquiring a deep understanding of new subject matter or of conditions in the host country. Research scholars are able to gain more profound insights into the country visited than are lecturers who devote most of their time to a single institution. Research, instead of confining a scholar's interest to a specialized problem, to a narrow area of scholarship, or to some very limited aspect of the life of a nation, as is frequently assumed, has stimulated or required extensive travel and contact with many people of different interests and in different walks of life. The research scholar in general has closer rapport with people and greater impact on the national scene."

The fiscal year 1969 federal funds for mutual educational and cultural exchange activities were cut by about one-third, from 44 million dollars to 31.4 million dollars. In 1970 the appropriation was 32 million; in 1971, 37 million; and in 1972 another increase brought available funds up to 40.5 million dollars. The budget squeeze caused many of the commissions to rethink their programs with the aim of stretching available funds or, in some cases, merely surviving. It is difficult to generalize about the different measures that were taken. In several Western European countries there has been a trend toward travel only grants to those receiving support from host institutions, or toward short-term full grants. The increased use of teaching fellows who receive lower stipends has been another development. In most countries the number of grants was drastically reduced and in at least one, no new grants were awarded for a time. As for foreign scholars, there has been movement towards short-term awards for periods of three months or less. This has enabled an increased number of scholars to make brief visits to American institutions to observe new developments in a specialized field or to obtain material for the completion of research already underway, but does not permit the extended working relationships that were a valuable feature of the program in the past. Strenuous efforts continue to be made to obtain support from American universities for foreign scholars with travel-only grants, but with diminishing success, as institutions here become hard-pressed to retain their own faculties.

A significant development in recent years, and perhaps the most impressive evidence of the esteem in which the Fulbright-Hays Program is held overseas, has been the emergence of cost-sharing. During the past decade a number of governments have agreed to share both administrative and grant expenses. Indeed, some countries have assumed a substantial portion of the total costs. This development has put the Program on a truly binational basis. Although it has always been binational in theory, so long as the financing was exclusively American, foreign representatives on the commissions tended to be at a disadvantage in the formulation of policy. The opinions of the American members sometimes dominated and the Board of Foreign Scholarships was the final arbiter of policy. It is generally recognized that countries with cost-sharing agreements will expect to have a greater input into the determination of policy, and occasionally the objectives of the commissions will not coincide with those of the Board. In order to minimize potential conflicts, it is important to strengthen and expand channels of communication between the Board, the cooperating agencies, the Department and the overseas commissions and foundations.

THE POTENTIAL OF THE FULBRIGHT-HAYS ACT
(The Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961)

Sec. 101 STATEMENT OF PURPOSE The purpose of this Act is to enable the Government of the United States to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries by means of educational and cultural exchange; to strengthen the ties which unite us with other nations by demonstrating the educational and cultural interests, developments, and achievements of the people of the United States and other nations, and the contributions being made toward a peaceful and more fruitful life for people throughout the world; to promote international cooperation for educational and cultural advancement; and thus to assist in the development of friendly, sympathetic, and peaceful relations between the United States and the other countries of the world.

The Fulbright-Hays Act was intended to consolidate the several pieces of legislation affecting educational exchange into one law, to correct certain specific problems in the existing program, and to provide increased flexibility and scope for development. It was, in fact, designed to make possible nearly any type of exchange activity. As Congressman Wayne Hays, one of the sponsors of the bill, stated, "This law is intended to give all the possible authority needed to develop this field adequately. If you don't find what you want, ask your lawyers to look harder." Despite the wide latitude that the law provides, it has little altered the pattern of educational exchange developed in the 1950s. The constraints to the realization of its potential are legislative, budgetary, and organizational in nature.

Briefly, the Fulbright-Hays Act provides for the following:

a. Two-way exchange of graduate students, teachers, and senior scholars.

b. Practically any type of educational exchange activity, in any subject matter.

c. Research by private organizations into the problems of educational exchange.

d. Grants either directly to individuals or through institutions.

e. Orientation and language courses for government-sponsored or non-sponsored individuals going abroad for "educational or cultural purposes that further the purposes of this Act."

f. Dependents' travel when it "furthers the purposes of this Act."

g. Exchange agreements with international organizations as well as foreign governments.

h. Binational or multinational commissions to administer the overseas programs.

i. Appropriations to remain available until expended.

j. Contracts in advance of appropriations when authorized by the appropriations act.

k. Dollars as well as foreign currencies for use by the exchange program.

l. Cost-sharing with participating governments.

m. An expanded Board of Foreign Scholarships to supervise all educational or academic exchanges under the Act.

n. Private participation and financial support.

The language of the legislation is permissive rather than mandatory; as a result not all of its provisions have been carried out. The authors of the Fulbright-Hays Act were well aware that educational exchange as a long-term effort should not be geared to a year-to-year budgeting cycle. Such provisions as appropriations remaining available until expended and contracts being made in advance of appropriations were intended to facilitate long-term planning. However, since they are not mandatory, the House Committee on Appropriations has not seen fit to implement them. Furthermore, they are not consistent with present policies of the Office of Management and Budget and the General Accounting Office. In the case of "no-year funding" the House Committee has indicated to the State Department that it would not look favorably on a request for increased appropriations if funds authorized for the current year were not fully obligated. Partly for this reason the educational exchange program has tended to operate on a year-to-year basis with little significant long-term planning.

Another unsolved problem stemming from the permissive character of the legislation relates to dependents' travel. Throughout the history of the program scholars have complained that because dependents' travel to and from the host country is not provided, the acceptance of a Fulbright grant imposes a substantial financial burden. The situation is sufficiently serious to hinder efforts to recruit scholars for critical openings. The Fulbright-Hays Act specifically authorizes—but does not require—that grants include dependents' travel. The Appropriations Committee has made it clear that it does not consider dependents' travel a justifiable expense. Consequently, more than a decade after the passage of the Act, scholars who wish to participate in the exchange program, even in service assignments which provide little or no opportunity to further their own scholarly careers, must still pay for the privilege.

At the same time, the flexibility of the legislation is its major strength. The law is intended to serve as a durable framework within which the exchange program may adapt to changing circumstances. It provides the authority to act; it is up to responsible officials in Congress, in the Executive branch, and in private organizations to use that authority.

The budgetary constraint upon the exchange program is the most obvious. The Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs has labored under several disadvantages in requesting appropriations from Congress. For one, some congressmen have persisted in regarding the exchange program primarily as means of reaching United States foreign policy goals. Results in these terms have proven difficult to demonstrate. Moreover, though this may have been one of the rationales of the program, it was certainly not its central purpose.

For another, the Bureau is particularly vulnerable to budget-cutting. The educational and cultural exchange appropriation, since it includes grant funds, is a sizable part of the total State Department budget. It is exceeded only by salaries and administrative expenses and contributions to international organizations. Salaries, administrative expenses, and contributions to international organizations are difficult to lower; grants to individuals, however, may easily be cut back. Consequently, Congressional efforts to hold down State Department spending have all too often been concentrated in the area of exchange activities. The American academic community, as the principal constituency of the program in this country, has not as a rule demonstrated coherent support to the extent necessary to influence Congress.

Though there have been gradual increases since the 1969 cutback, appropriations are still well below the level of the preceding period. When the effects of inflation are taken into account, the program is doing little more than holding its own and it is unlikely that Congress

will, in the foreseeable future, provide funds to support a level of activity significantly greater than at present. Therefore, future efforts to implement the Fulbright-Hays Act more effectively will involve the reallocation of funds from one area or emphasis to another rather than an increase in activity, except in those countries which themselves make a major contribution to the program.

The organizational constraint arises from the fact that a complete consensus of purpose among the several agencies that participate in the administration of the program has never been achieved. Each has its own values and viewpoints derived from the constituency it serves. This may at times lead to disagreements over the specifics of educational exchange and the direction of the program. To illustrate:

The State Department is concerned with the development of informal communications between this and other countries to affect favorably the environment within which U.S. foreign policy is conducted. It sees the program as a means of increasing the numbers of those who can serve as "influential interpreters" between this and other nations, and of improving channels for the exchange of both information and ideas. Mutuality in planning, participation, support and benefit has increasingly been emphasized as a goal.

The national members of an overseas commission naturally have their own conception of the Fulbright-Hays program. In the less developed countries exchange is often seen in the context of national development. The program is regarded as another means of obtaining technical and educational aid. This pattern is not typical of the relatively advanced countries of Western Europe. There, lecturing or research awards, or a combination of the two, in a broad range of academic fields are more characteristic.

Finally, the American academic community, represented in the program by the cooperating agencies has a still different attitude. The Fulbright-Hays program at least in some countries, offers the individual academic the opportunity to further his professional career by conducting research or field studies overseas and through the prestige that is attached to the award. These considerations have led the academic community to hold a more traditional laissez-faire view of the program. Educational exchange, it is held, should be geared to the interests of the individual scholar. The academic qualifications of the candidates and the merits of their proposals should be the principal criteria for selection. The emphasis should be on scholarship itself, rather than on structured projects conceived by government officials or educational institutions. A program of this type, it is argued, will better serve the

national interests in the broad sense, by stimulating mutual understanding and establishing more enduring channels of communication.

Nevertheless, it is important to reemphasize that the involved agencies do share common goals and objectives. Each recognizes the validity of the others' viewpoints. Their differences are a matter of priorities and are not necessarily irreconcilable.

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

JAMES BILLINGTON *Professor of History*, Princeton University, *Chairman*, Board of Foreign Scholarships

*CHARLES BLITZER *Assistant Secretary for History and Art*, Smithsonian Institution, Chairman, CIEP

PAUL BRAISTED *Coordinator*, Cultural Relations for the Future

FREDERICK BURKHARDT *President*, American Council of Learned Societies, Chairman, Conference Board of Associated Research Councils

*JAMES STACY COLES *President*, The Research Corporation

*WM. THEODORE DE BARY *Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs*, Columbia University

*MONROE DONSKER *Professor of Mathematics*, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University, *Vice Chairman*, CIEP

CHARLES FRANKEL *Old Dominion Professor of Philosophy and Public Affairs*, Columbia University

*FRANK FREIDEL *Professor of History*, Harvard University

W. TODD FURNISS *Director*, Commission on Academic Affairs, American Council on Education

*ROBERT GALAMBOS *Professor of Neurosciences*, University of California at San Diego

PHILIP HANDLER *President*, National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council

* CIEP Member

ELAINE HARRIS *Executive Assistant*, Committee on International Exchange of Persons

JOHN HILLIARD *Director*, Office of Education and Human Resources, Bureau for Technical Assistance, Agency for International Development

JOHN HOLZMAN *Staff Assistant*, Committee on International Exchange of Persons

*ELEANOR JORDEN *Professor of Linguistics*, Cornell University

WILLIAM KELLY *Director*, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Research Council

RICHARD PARK *Secretary-Treasurer*, Association for Asian Studies, Inc.; *Professor of Political Science*, University of Michigan

*JOHN PLANK *Director*, Institute of International and Intercultural Studies, University of Connecticut

PETER ROSE *Chairman*, Department of Sociology & Anthropology, Smith College

RICHARD ROTH *Director*, Office of Policy and Plans, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State

ELEANOR SHELDON *Executive Associate*, The Russell Sage Foundation; *President Elect*, Social Science Research Council

NATSUO SHUMUTA *Executive Director*, U.S. Educational Commission in Japan

*CATHERINE SIMS *Dean*, Sweet Briar College

*FRANK SNOWDEN, JR. *Professor of Classics*, Howard University

W. MURRAY TODD *Executive Secretary*, Office of the Foreign Secretary, National Academy of Sciences

RALPH TYLER *Acting President*, Social Science Research Council

ROY WHITEKER *Executive Secretary*, Committee on International Exchange of Persons

* CIEP Member